

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

8  
9  
10 AARON VRH

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 NICHOLE GORDIAN, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

15 Case No. 1:24-cv-01248-JLT-EPG (PC)

16 ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THIS  
ACTION PROCEED ON CERTAIN  
CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS AND  
THAT ALL OTHER CLAIMS BE  
DISMISSED

17 (Docs. 14, 17.)

18  
19 On August 28, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge entered findings and  
20 recommendations, recommending that this action proceed only on Plaintiff's claims concerning:  
21 (1) violation of his right to be free from unconstitutional conditions of confinement against  
22 Defendant Gordian; (2) retaliation against Defendants Dunas, Genseal, and De La Garza; (3)  
23 deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs against Defendants Dr. Shin, Nurse Anderson,  
24 Nurse Johnson, Dr. Longia, and Dr. Bansal; and (4) denial of due process related to his RVR  
25 proceedings against Defendants Ramirez, Guzman, and Andrade. (Doc. 20.) The magistrate judge  
26 recommended that all other claims and defendants be dismissed. (*Id.*) The Court served the  
27 findings and recommendations on the plaintiff and notified him that any objections were due  
28

1 within 30 days. (*Id.* at 28.) The Court advised him that the “failure to file objections within the  
2 specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal.” (*Id.*, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772  
3 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections and the time to do so has  
4 passed.

5 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this Court has conducted a *de*  
6 *novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including the objections, the  
7 Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.  
8 Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 9       1. The findings and recommendations issued on August 28, 2025, are **ADOPTED IN**  
10      **FULL.** (Doc. 20.)
- 11      2. This case proceed on Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint on the following  
12      claims: (1) the violation of Plaintiff’s right to be free from unconstitutional  
13      conditions of confinement under the Eighth Amendment against Defendant  
14      Gordian; (2) retaliation in violation of the First Amendment against Defendants  
15      Dunas, Genseal, and De La Garza; (3) deliberate indifference to his serious  
16      medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendants Dr. Shin,  
17      Nurse Anderson, Nurse Johnson, Dr. Longia, and Dr. Bansal; and (4) denial of due  
18      process in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment against Defendants Ramirez,  
19      Guzman, and Andrade.
- 20      3. All other claims and Defendants be dismissed without further leave to amend.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: October 20, 2025

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28